

**C. REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance are requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

**35 U.S.C. §101 Rejection**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as not being in the technological art. Applicants traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

While Applicants disagree with the grounds rejections, independent claim 1 has been amended in order to expedite prosecution. Applicants submit that claim 1 clearly recites statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. §101.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are requested.

**35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,611,052 to Dykstra et al. ("Dykstra") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,209,095 to Anderson et al. ("Anderson"). Applicants traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

As set forth in the Office Action, the Examiner admits that Dykstra fails to teach or suggest "the plurality of tasks required by federal or state law."<sup>1</sup> In order to remedy this admitted deficiency, the Examiner relies on Anderson for teaching a "mortgage loan

---

<sup>1</sup> See Office action, at pp. 3-4.

application... designed to be complied with mortgage lending regulations."<sup>2</sup> The Examiner alleges that "[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow the mortgage processing method of Dykstra to include the feature of the requiring mortgage application process to be complied with the mortgage lending regulations for preventing illegal loan transactions."<sup>3</sup>

While Applicants do not agree with the Examiner's grounds rejections, independent claims 1, 7, 11, 12, and 15 have been amended in order to expedite prosecution. Namely, Applicants have amended the claims to recite a comprehensive list of tasks required to comply with federal rules and regulations, state rules and regulations, and local rules and regulations and generating a plurality of task actions comprising a subset of the comprehensive list and identifying actions required to process the mortgage loan in compliance with applicable federal or state law.

Applicants remind the Examiner that in order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings.<sup>4</sup> In addition, there must be a reasonable expectation of success.<sup>5</sup> Moreover, the prior art must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations.<sup>6</sup> Such teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both

---

<sup>2</sup> *Id.*

<sup>3</sup> *Id.*

<sup>4</sup> See MPEP § 2143 citing In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

<sup>5</sup> *Id.*

<sup>6</sup> *Id.*

be found in the prior art, not in applicant's disclosure.<sup>7</sup>

Applicants submit that Dykstra and Anderson clearly fail to teach or suggest all the elements of independent claims 1, 7, 11, 12, and 15, as amended. At most, Anderson teaches "[w]hen the document is a mortgage loan application, the document can be designed to comply with mortgage lending regulations."<sup>8</sup> As such, even if Dykstra and Anderson could be combined, which Applicants do not admit, such a combination clearly would fail to teach or suggest all the features of independent claims 1, 7, 11, 12, and 15.

In addition, Applicants contend that the prior art of record, including Dykstra and Anderson, fails to provide any suggestion or motivation to modify the teachings of Dykstra and/or Anderson to provide a comprehensive list of tasks required to comply with federal rules and regulations, state rules and regulations, and local rules and regulations and to generate a plurality of task actions comprising a subset of the comprehensive list and identifying actions required to process the mortgage loan in compliance with applicable federal or state law, as recited by amended independent claims 1, 7, 13, and 21.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that the teachings of Dykstra and Anderson are insufficient to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claims 1-17. Moreover, Applicants submit that claims 1-17 each recite a combination of features neither taught nor suggested by the prior art, including Dykstra, alone or in combination with Anderson and/or the other references of record, and that such claims are allowable for at least this reason.

Accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

---

<sup>7</sup> *Id.*


<sup>8</sup> See Anderson at col. 10, ll. 65-67.

**D. CONCLUSION**

Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and requests favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance. Should the Examiner believe that this application is in condition for disposition other than allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below in order to address the Examiner's concerns.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 18, 2005

  
Robert V. Racunas, Jr.  
Reg. No. 43,027

KIRKPATRICK & LOCKHART, LLP  
Henry W. Oliver Building  
535 Smithfield Street  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15222  
Telephone: (412) 355-6279  
Facsimile: (412) 355-6501  
E-mail: [rracunas@kl.com](mailto:rracunas@kl.com)